MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING HELD ON July 14, 2022 AT THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

ATTENDING: Mr. Joshua Bernsen (JB)

Mr. Jean-Pierre Mahé (JPM)

Ms. Nancy Paul (NP) Mr. Don Aldersley (DA) Mr. James Blake (JBI) Mr. Brian Newton (BN)

REGRETS: Mr. Kelvin Lit (KL)

Mr. Rajesh Kumar (RK)
Sgt. Kevin Bracewell (KB)
Ms. Alexis Chicoine (AC)
Mr. Nathan Shuttleworth (NS)

STAFF: Mr. Andrew Norton (Item 3.a)

Mr. Alfonso Teiada

Mr. Kevin Zhang (Staff Liaison)

Ms. Holly Adams

APPLICANT: Reza Salehi, Architect

Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect

Ryan Rohani, Applicant Adel Bellem, Applicant

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Kevin Zhang, Staff Liaison, asked the Panel a question whether they want to receive
physical packages or digital packages. The Panel determined to continue receiving
physical packages unless indicated otherwise.

Mr. James Blake opened the meeting at 6:05 pm and carried-out a round table introduction of the panel to welcome the newest panel member, Mr. Brian Newton. Mr. Blake explained how the meeting would proceed.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada had a suggestion for adjusting the timing of the question period during the meeting. The Panel determined to discuss this matter at the end of the meeting.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Don Aldersley, seconded by Ms. Nancy Paul, and carried, to adopt the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting of June 9, 2022.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a.) Address: 1504 – 1516 Rupert Street

Project: Preliminary Application for a OCP Amendment, Rezoning and Development Permit for a 6-storey residential apartment

Mr. Andrew Norton, Development Planner, provided a brief presentation on the project.

- Project consists of a 6-storey residential apartment building which requires an OCP Amendment, Rezoning and a Development Permit. The project is currently in the preliminary planning application phase.
- Overview of the OCP and zoning of the property including land use, density, maximum FSR, and surrounding context.
- Overview of the context of Lynn Creek Town Centre and current/nearby projects.
- Building design addresses the Lynn Creek Public Realm Guidelines, Lower Lynn Town Centre Implementation Plan, Official Community Plan Guidelines, and other relevant policies.
- Of note is the site's location in the Creek Hazard Development Permit Area, and that it is proposed to have 70 rental apartments with 33 car parking spaces in one level of underground parking.
- Items that staff are seeking input on:
 - o Building bulk and massing, materiality, and ground-floor treatment;
 - General building siting, including adequacy of setback from the development to the north; and
 - Quality of residential amenity, including balcony design and placement, particularly on the east elevation.

The project team, Ryan Rohani, Applicant; Adel Bellem, Applicant; Reza Salehi, Architect; and Daryl Tyacke, Landscape Architect presented on the project and highlighted the following information for consideration:

- The 10 ft. dedication along the west property line results in reducing the frontage along Rupert St., however, the required purchase of the lane creates adequate frontage.
- The ramp of the parkade must be along the east property line and will be a shared ramp for the future development of the project to the east. This eliminates the need for a second parkade ramp.
- Being located in a flood-hazard area has shaped the building layout and location of certain elements, for example, service rooms need to be on the first floor above the flood construction level and the storm-water tank is located at the north-east corner of lot.
- All units meet basic accessibility design features with 10 units including enhanced adaptable features (more than required).
- Main building entrance is from Mountain Highway, and the project is close to Phibbs Exchange Bus Loop, the Town Centre and Main Street for retail shops, etc.
- The project compliments the 5-storey town house building to the south and the 6-storey strata building to the north. Together, these buildings will provide the neighbourhood with

- a range of housing types and provide an activated public realm to and from the future heart of the Town Center.
- There is a pedestrian access ramp with the main building entrance and there is a large indoor amenity area at the south-west corner of the building off the main lobby. There is also a roof-top amenity area.
- There is a pedestrian walkway and bike route along the east side of property which leads to Phibbs Exchange Bus Loop.
- 33 parking stalls have been provided and the requested variance to parking is justified due to proximity to transit.
- There is a longer frontage along Mountain Highway compared to Rupert Street (due to lane) and so the exterior finishing materials and wrap-around balconies are focused on the north and south-west sides of the building.
- The 5th and 6th storeys on the side facing Rupert Street are stepped back, with the 6th storey stepped back on all sides to provide a wider roof-deck and balcony.
- Ground-floor units facing Rupert Street and Mountain Highway take advantage of their location with patios and gates with front entrances directly from the sidewalks. This helps create a welcoming street and public realm while the private patio space is separated with planters, glass, etc.
- Large windows provide surveillance, security cameras are located over key areas
 including the front doors, and visitor and resident parking are separated. Bike storage is
 within the secured parking area and fenced.

Mr. Daryl Tyacke spoke to the landscape design specifically:

- The preliminary concept is based on the project across Rupert Street.
- The two projects will work together to maximize outdoor amenity space for social gathering and community building.
- Maximize amenity space on 6th floor terrace.
- More details will be provided at the detailed stage.

The Chair opened up the floor to the Panel for questions.

Q: What happens to other people when they want to park as only 33 spaces are provided but there are 70 units?

A: The flood-plain is constraining the ability to provide more underground parking and proximity to Phibbs Exchange helps to reduce need for parking. The occupants of smaller rental units tend to not own a car.

- Q: The trees that are in the sidewalks are in grates. How does this work?

 A: These are 4-section tree grates, a 4 foot by 12 foot grate for each tree is provided, and under the walkways there is enough structural soil.
- Q: Does the walkway on the north side, where the lane has taken over, interface with the building north on Crown Street?

A: The walkway along the north side is for access to the electrical room, as per BC Hydro requirements. This walkway abuts the retaining wall located on the property to the north and will be lower than the north building elevation.

Q: Will a context plan be provided in the future?

A: It will be required.

Q: There is reduced parking of less than 50 percent cars in relation to the units. Will the parkade ramp will be shared with future development to the east?

A: The DNV has asked for it to be shared with a knock-out wall. A covenant on title obligates the knock-out wall and this is brought to the attention of the future neighbouring development.

Q: Is a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) required?

A: Yes, depending on the project size, either a specific Traffic Study is required by the District or existing studies are used. It will include the neighbouring Parkade.

Q: Do the garbage bins get moved up the ramp and stored there? This will impact the neighbouring project.

A: The neighbouring project will have their own garbage area and staging area.

Q: Are there requirements surrounding inbound bedrooms?

A: There have been on other projects and typically these units are studios.

Mr. Alfonso Tejada, Urban Design Planner, gave a brief presentation and provided the following comments for consideration:

- Provided the context of the building and explained how it goes property line to property line and wanted to know the relationship between the two buildings.
- The proximity between the two buildings is a concern. Does not currently meet our Design Guidelines.
- The built form and character needs improvement, for example, the blank section of wall needs further development to create coherent elevations.
- The elevations need to be re-considered and the colour palette could be improved.

The following comments were provided by the panel:

- The size of the toddler play area needs to be increased and its location next to Mountain Highway could be re-considered.
- The unit (west of the electrical room) needs improvement to liveability and safety.
- Need a context plan to better understand the project. This could be done with either a
 physical model or with Sketch-Up to show surrounding buildings to better understand
 this portion of the block. It will also help to understand the use of outdoor amenity
 spaces and how they're shared.
- The green areas don't do much for the east-side of the building, unless the building to the east can use this (connect north-south).

- North-east side of building has a lot of deeply-recessed areas. This corner could use more thought.
- The proposed building setback to the north is less than 30 feet away. The balcony separation is even less than this and it creates privacy concerns. Mr. Alfonso Tejada explained the distance between the balconies and how they are too close together. A 30-foot building separation is typically used for 3-storey town homes and is not meant for a building this tall.
- The landscaping on the west is a nice continuation of what's happening to the north. The
 next iteration could include site furnishings and benches could be fit between the trees.
 Benches should face pedestrian path.
- The open space on the north-east needs to be re-thought. It is the only open large
 outdoor space and would be used the most. It may be less convenient to access (only
 via one dead-end path) and may also experience security issues for this reason. It is
 also next to the PMT and will be shaded. Could be a lost opportunity for units to open up
 onto.
- If FSR is reduced a bit, the building could be pushed back, and the balconies could be adjusted.
- A question was raised about fire separation concerns and the Panel explained that fire (spatial) separation would have to be met under applicable codes.
- Building design seems to be a bit institutional.
- Garbage by the exit stairs is not ideal because it may be blocked.
- There may be opportunity to replace some of the stairs with more ramping.

The Chair offered the group to give any comments. No additional comments were given.

The applicants thanked the Panel for their comments.

• Client had strong requirements on the outdoor amenity space location, but all comments should be able to be considered and incorporated.

The Chair invited the Panel to compose a motion.

THAT the ADP has reviewed the proposal and cannot support the general concept and recommends reconsideration of the proposal to address the items noted by the Panel and look forward to a presentation at the detailed application stage of the new concept.

MOVED by Mr. Joshua Bellemlih and **SECONDED** by Mr. Don Aldersley.

CARRIED

None opposed

The Chair thanked the presenters and explained the process during the detailed application stage.

The Panel and staff discussed combining the comments and question period during application review as well as the ability for the applicant to answer questions.

It was agreed that the applicant can be reminded they will have a chance to answer questions at the end of the meeting and this can be added into the agenda.

It was agreed to keep the question format as is and to better ensure the question period is only used for questions.

The Panel discussed the level of detail which should be provided at the preliminary application stage and what other information can be shared with the Panel.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

4. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

Chair

Date